

Remarks

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-19 and 21-27 remain pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 24, 25 and 27 are amended in this Response. The Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection and request allowance of claims 1, 3-10, 12-19 and 21-27.

Claim Amendments

Independent claims 1, 10 and 19 are amended herein to include "a first requesting communication device employed by a first user." Also, these claims further provide that "the first card configuration associates the first intranet access card with the intranet configuration," and that "the first card configuration comprises information for configuring the first requesting communication device of the first user for optimal access speed over the connection with the intranet configuration." These provisions are supported in the current application at page 9, lines 19-23.

Claims 3, 12 and 21 are amended herein to correct improper dependence upon canceled claims 2, 11 and 20.

Claims 6, 7, 9, 15, 16, 18, 24, 25 and 27 are amended herein to properly correspond with the current amendments of independent claims 1, 10 and 19.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-19 and 21-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0029350 A1 to Cooper et al. (hereinafter "Cooper") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0054019 A1 to de Fabrega (hereinafter "de Fabrega") and U.S. Patent No. 6,223,177 to Tatham et al. (hereinafter "Tatham"). The Assignee submits that current claims 1, 3-10, 12-19 and 21-27 are novel and non-obvious over the combination of Cooper, de Fabrega and Tatham in light of the current amendments to claims 1, 10 and 19, and the following discussion.

Amendments to the Independent Claims

Independent claim 1 currently provides, in part, that "the first card configuration associates the first intranet access card with the intranet configuration," and further that "the first

card configuration comprises information for configuring the first requesting communication device of the first user for optimal access speed over the connection with the intranet configuration." Independent claims 10 and 19 provide similar limitations.

None of the cited references, either individually or in combination, teach or suggest these provisions. More specifically, none of the references disclose a card configuration identified with a user, utilized in tandem with a separate intranet configuration employable by multiple users. As a result, none of the references teach or suggest a need or desire to employ a card configuration associating an intranet access card with a particular intranet configuration, as provided for in claims 1, 10 and 19. Employing separate intranet and card configurations allows the specification of a single intranet configuration to be employed by multiple users, with each user having an intranet access card related to its own card configuration. The combination of the card and intranet configurations thus provides the necessary information to connect each user to the appropriate intranet configuration without duplicating a specification of the intranet configuration for each user.

Further, none of the references teach or suggest a card configuration having information for increasing access speed over a connection between the intranet configuration and the communication device being employed by the user, as provided for in claims 1, 10 and 19. For example, each of the Public Email Terminals (PETs) of Cooper, being a publicly-accessible unit located "in public facilities such as airports, restaurants, parking lots, parks, gymnasiums, and other such locations," (paragraph 0285]) is likely to exhibit the same connection characteristics regardless of the user of the PET at any particular time. The public portal 10 of de Fabrega (Fig. 2) is employed by a variety of members of the public in a similar fashion. Thus, the connection of such publicly-accessible units to their associated networks is the same for each user. Thus, none of Cooper, de Fabrega, or any other cited reference suggests a card configuration for a user's intranet access card, wherein the card configuration includes "information for configuring the first requesting communication device of the first user for optimal access speed."

Tatham

The Office action indicates that "Tatham discloses a network based groupware system and teaches the establishment of a dedicated intranet site wherein a plurality of users may connect to the intranet configuration (Col. 3, lines 50-55; Col. 4, lines 1-10, 25-35 and 42-60). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the method of Cooper and include the ability for a plurality of users to use a particular intranet configuration as taught by Tatham et al." Page 4 of the Office action. The Assignee respectfully disagrees with this characterization of Tatham.

Generally, Tatham discloses a server 10 which allows the formation of a workgroup concentrating on a particular group project. Column 4, lines 49-52; and Fig. 1. In forming a workgroup, a primary user defines various parameters of the group, such as the name and website of the workgroup to be created, scope of the project undertaken, number and contact addresses of group members, and the types of user application to be utilized. Column 4, lines 55-65. However, the specification of a particular intranet configuration, which "*defines at least one connection employable by a plurality of users between a plurality of intranet communication devices within the intranet,*" is not discussed or disclosed in Tatham (emphasis supplied). Instead, a single server 10, to which a primary user 30 and a secondary user 40 are connected, is presented which provides multiple websites for the various workgroups and individuals. Column 3, lines 61-67; and Fig. 1. Thus, no specification of an intranet configuration is required for each workgroup, as each workgroup apparently employs the same connections within the intranet (i.e., server 10, as shown in Fig. 1). Thus, neither Tatham nor any other cited reference provides motivation for a particular intranet configuration for a plurality of users, as described in claims 1, 10 and 19.

Based on at least the foregoing reasons, the Assignee believes claims 1, 10 and 19 are allowable, and such indication is respectfully requested.

Further, since claims 3-9 depend from independent claim 1, claims 12-18 depend from independent claim 10, and claims 21-27 depend from independent claim 19, the Assignee asserts that each of these sets of dependent claims are allowable for at least the reasons provided above for their respective independent claims.

Therefore, the Assignee respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 3-10, 12-19 and 21-27 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Based on the above remarks, the Assignee submits that claims 1, 3-10, 12-19 and 21-27 are allowable. Additional reasons in support of patentability may exist, but such reasons are omitted in the interests of clarity and brevity. The Assignee thus respectfully requests allowance of claims 1, 3-10, 12-19 and 21-27.

The Assignee believes no additional fees are due with respect to this filing. However, should the Office determine additional fees are necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 21-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5/5/05

**SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER**

Kyle J. Way, Reg. No. 45,549
Setter Ollila, LLC
Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 21
Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004

Attn: Harley R. Ball
6391 Sprint Parkway
Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100
Overland Park, KS 66251-2100